DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 516 TM 850 023

AUTHOR Alkin, Marvin C.; And Others
TITLE Factors Common to High-Utilization Evaluations. Evaluation Productivity Project.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CSE-240
PUB DATE Nov 84
GRANT NIE-G-84-0112-P2
NOTE 37p.; Also available as part of TM 850 021.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; Decision Making; *Evaluation Utilization; *Evaluators; *Experimenter Characteristics; Leadership Qualities; Predictor Variables
IDENTIFIERS Evaluation Reports

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the factors that characterize high-utilization evaluations. It is based on materials submitted to an American Educational Research Association (AERA) Division H competition for outstanding examples of evaluation utilization. The paper is organized into three sections. The first section outlines the background of the study: the purposes and procedures of the Division H competition, and the conceptual framework used in analyzing the data. The second section describes the analytic methods used, summarizes the results of the analysis, and specifies the six factors that seem to distinguish evaluations whose results are used by decision-makers. These factors are: level of evaluator effort, evaluator's leadership behavior, user involvement, evaluation reporting, evaluator involvement in implementing recommendations, and user commitment to use. The final section profiles the evaluators themselves. The data are viewed and interpreted from a multidisciplinary perspective which draws upon theories from psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, management, and marketing. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251516

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DELIVERABLE -- NOVEMBER 1984

EVALUATION PRODUCTIVITY PROJECT

Factors Common to High-Utilization Evaluations

Marvin C. Alkin
Project Director

Grant Number
NIE-G-84-0112, P2

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EVALUATION
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

TM 852 023

Factors Common to High-Utilization Evaluations

Report Prepared by:

Joan A. Ruskus
Marvin C. Alkin

Center for the Study of Evaluation
University of California, Los Angeles

November 1984
Regents of the University of California

FACTORS COMMON TO HIGH-UTILIZATION EVALUATIONS

Joan A. Ruskus
Marvin C. Alkin

CSE Report No. 240
1984

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EVALUATION
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
BACKGROUND	1
Competition Procedures	2
Conceptual Framework	3
ANALYSIS OF APPLICANT DATA	5
Level of Evaluator Effort	6
Leadership Behavior	7
User Involvement	9
Evaluation Reporting	11
Evaluator Involvement in Implementing Recommendations	13
User Commitment to Use	14
PROFILE OF A HIGH-UTILIZATION EVALUATOR	15
REFERENCES	

This paper reports on the factors that characterize high-utilization evaluations. It is based on materials submitted to an AERA Division H competition that was instigated and organized by the Evaluation Productivity Project of UCLA's Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE). This project, which is funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE), has been at the forefront of research on evaluation utilization.

The paper is organized into three sections. The first section outlines the background of the study: the purposes and procedures of the Division H competition, and the conceptual framework used in analyzing the data. The second section describes the analytic methods, summarizes the results of the analysis, and specifies the six factors that seem to distinguish evaluations whose results are used by decision-makers. The final section profiles the evaluators themselves. The data are viewed and interpreted from a multidisciplinary perspective which draws upon theories from psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, management, and marketing.

BACKGROUND

The primary purpose of the Division H competition was to recognize and reward excellence in promoting evaluation use. Its

secondary purposes were to make both evaluators and potential users more use-oriented and to encourage practitioners to engage in those kinds of behaviors that seem to promote evaluation utilization.

Competition Procedures

Evaluators entering the Division H competition were required to submit an application form (see Appendix A) in which they discussed those features of the evaluation that, in their judgement, had contributed significantly to its ultimate utilization. Evaluation utilization was verified by means of materials submitted by evaluation users, who were asked to indicate the extent of use and to specify those aspects of the evaluator's performance that had contributed to use (see Verification Form in Appendix B). Over 30 users (administrators of the target programs) submitted such materials.

Twelve evaluation studies were entered into the competition. While all of them dealt with educational programs, the majority (seven) were directed to public school programs at the district level. Of the remaining five, three addressed university programs; one, a statewide educational program; and one, a vocational education program for a special-needs population. Three of the twelve studies focused specifically on teacher effectiveness. Most of the evaluators had been retained as private consultants, although four were employees of the organizations housing the program being evaluated.

The review process involved over twenty judges, all of them Division H members, who were selected either because they had contributed to the literature on evaluation use or because they were among the leading evaluation practitioners. Each evaluation study, along with the documents submitted as supporting evidence, was reviewed by three judges, who rated applicants on four dimensions: (1) conception of evaluation use, (2) extent of evaluation use, (3) degree of direct link between the evaluator's efforts and subsequent use, and (4) uniqueness/creativity of the evaluator's efforts to promote use (see Reviewer Rating Form in Appendix C). In addition, to ensure against rater bias, each rater ranked the applicants whom she or he had reviewed. Ratings were then totaled, and from these total scores, four finalists were identified; a fifth finalist who had received relatively high rankings was added to this group. The competition winner, and two honorable mentions, were chosen by a subset of raters at a full discussion session of the 1984 AERA convention.

Conceptual Framework

According to the definition employed in this paper, which was developed by Alkin (1975) and Patton et al. (1978), the term "use" is not limited to the direct application of evaluation findings to a specific decision but rather refers to the broader supporting role that evaluation findings often play in the complex, ongoing process of decision-making. As Alkin (1982) points out, the best definition for utilization is one that recognizes the gradual, incremental influence of evaluation.

This view of utilization was further developed by CSE through a series of evaluation case studies (Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979), an evaluator field study (Daillak, 1980), and an administrator user survey (Stecher, Alkin, & Flesher, 1981).

On the basis of these empirical data, Alkin and his colleagues (1985, in press) have developed a "utilization framework" that classifies the factors affecting evaluation use into three interrelated categories: human factors (evaluator and user characteristics); context factors (pre-existing evaluation bounds, organizational features, and project characteristics); and evaluation factors (procedures, information dialogue, substance of information, and reporting). Within each of these factors, specific elements that influence utilization have been identified. For example, critical evaluator characteristics include commitment to use, rapport with users, and credibility. Critical user characteristics include interest in the evaluation, commitment to use, and information-processing preferences. Pre-existing evaluation bounds, a context factor, encompasses written requirements, contractual obligations, and fiscal constraints. Evaluation reporting, an evaluation factor, includes the frequency and timing of reports and the mix of statistical and narrative data in reports. Many other elements are subsumed under the various factors (for a complete listing, see Alkin et al. (1985, in press)).

ANALYSIS OF APPLICANT DATA

The comments of users and evaluators were analyzed by reading through the application and verification materials and abstracting all statements pertaining to use. These statements were then classified according to the three categories of utilization factors: human, context, and evaluation. (User data are summarized in Appendix D, and evaluator data in Appendix E.) In some instances, the results confirmed the importance of the factors already specified in the utilization framework described above. In other cases, the results suggested that certain factors not explicitly identified by previous research need to be further explored, with a view to elaborating the framework.

Almost half of both the users' and the evaluators' comments pertained to human factors, and nearly all of the remainder referred to evaluation factors. Context factors were rarely mentioned, probably because the competition emphasized the evaluator's contribution to enhanced utilization.

The most frequently cited evaluator characteristics were choice of role and willingness to involve users in the evaluation. The users' interpretation of choice of role is a unique one and will be discussed in more detail below. Also important were the evaluator's credibility and rapport with users.

The evaluation factors most frequently mentioned were procedures and reporting. Both users and evaluators recognized the importance of sound methodology, user-oriented designs, and

follow-up procedures. Of the several reporting features cited as contributing to evaluation utilization, a good balance between statistical and narrative data was seen as most relevant.

While the factors cited by evaluators tended to confirm the utilization framework already developed, users' comments suggested some additional factors that may influence utilization. Because of their significance from the users' perspective, six factors merit further discussion for the insight they give into utilization:

- o Level of evaluator effort
- o Leadership behavior
- o User involvement
- o Evaluation reporting
- o Evaluator involvement in implementing recommendations
- o User commitment to use

Level of Evaluator Effort

Users frequently said that the exceptional level of effort which the evaluator put into the evaluation contributed to their utilization of the results. The following comments illustrate this point:

> The evaluator (E) has been willing to expend time and energy beyond the typical work day to do the necessary work.
>
> The sustained efforts of E over the last three years have insured that there is a broad commitment to this evaluation.
>
> E's drive to see the project through and willingness to reach out and help contributed to making the evaluation useful.

Clearly, users appreciate the effort put forth by the evaluator, not only because it results in a higher-quality evaluation and a better evaluation report but also because it signifies a commitment to the evaluation and a concern about its outcomes. It would seem, then, that when the evaluator manifests a high level of energy, the likelihood of evaluation use increases.

The equity theory of motivation (Adams, 1965; Weick, 1966) suggests that something besides simple appreciation is at work here. This social comparison theory views human relationships as transactions involving inputs and outputs. In negotiating exchanges in the work environment, people seek a balance between inputs and outputs. According to this theory, the evaluator's level of effort constitutes an input, and utilization of the recommendations advocated by the evaluator constitutes an output. Therefore, when level of evaluator effort is judged to be high, users are motivated to demonstrate high utilization.

Leadership Behavior

A number of the evaluator characteristics noted by users as contributing to utilization can be characterized as leadership behaviors. And while some of these behaviors are already represented in the utilization framework (i.e., choice of role), it seems reasonable to restructure the framework slightly by subsuming these elements under the "leadership behavior" rubric. Such an alternative conceptualization may provide additional

insights into the dynamics of evaluation utilization.

A sizable portion of the management literature deals with the definition of leadership and of what constitutes leadership behavior (see Fiedler, 1967; Hollander, 1978; House & Baetz, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Vroom & Yetten, 1973). Perhaps the most thorough of these discussions comes from social psychologists like Rensis Likert (1961) and Ralph Stogdill (1974), who have identified nine dimensions of leadership: initiation (originates new ideas and new practices), membership (mixes with the group), representation (acts in behalf of the group), integration (reduces conflicts between members), organization (structures the work of members), communication (provides information to members and shows awareness of affairs pertaining to the group), recognition (expresses approval of group members), production (sets levels of effort for greater achievement), and consideration (helps members and explains procedures). These dimensions were epitomized in the actions of evaluators, as reported in a number of statements made by users:

> E's information caused us to initiate actions that might never have been taken without his impetus. (Initiation)
>
> E has the ability to develop rapport and trust with key program personnel. This trust is reflected in the way those she interviews and surveys open up to her with total confidence. (Membership)
>
> The information E has been able to provide for us was just the documentation we needed to justify program decisions. (Representation)
>
> E worked with program personnel and upper administration to resolve conflicts, facilitating a process where all points of view were heard. (Integration)

> The evaluation report contained practical management plans based on the findings. (Organization)
>
> E's evaluation report was primarily useful in telling our story. He was capable of making explicit our commonly held (but taken for granted) assumptions about what we do and why we do it. (Communication)
>
> E has provided the impetus for the development of goals and objectives to strengthen and improve programs. (Production)
>
> E provided the staff directly connected to the program . . . with much positive feedback. (Recognition)
>
> E explained what could and could not be measured, what instruments would be used and why. (Consideration)

User Involvement

The evaluator's willingness to involve users -- already identified in the utilization framework as an important evaluator characteristic -- deserves further examination because of the frequency with which it was mentioned, both by users and by evaluators, as a determinant of utilization. Users expressed the importance of their own involvement as follows:

> As superintendent, I was involved in the total process enough to follow through on the report.
>
> E developed "ownership" from the beginning of the evaluation process so that participants actually thought of it as "their" evaluation.
>
> During planning, E reached out to program participants for their involvement, assuring broad-based ownership of the entire evaluative process.

It makes intuitive sense that users will be more likely to use information that they asked for or played a part in generating, but is there more to it than that? Participant management theory (Likert, 1967) maintains that user involvement

is a critical component of effective management. Participant management is characterized by supportive relationships, group decision-making, group methods of supervision, and organizational objectives that reflect the needs and desires of all shareholders in the organization. According to its proponents, not only does this method of management make for better decisions, but it also guarantees that people will be more committed to carrying out these decisions. Evaluators who strive to build rapport with users, who involve users in the design of the evaluation and in data collection, and who consider the information needs of all users are following the principles of participant management, whether they are aware of it or not. While this theory validates the inclusion of users in decision-making, it does not really explain why this technique is so powerful.

One possible explanation is that involving users in the process of evaluation changes their attitudes about what the program should be and how it should operate. This new attitude is reflected in the recommendations that emerge from the evaluation. Thus, acting on the recommendations is consistent with their attitudes, whereas failure to use evaluation findings is likely to result in a state of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) which must eventually be resolved. User involvement is really a technique for attitude change that, once accomplished, motivates behavioral change.

Evaluation Reporting

While the utilization framework identifies several elements of evaluation reporting -- notably, content of reports (Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979) and style (Brown, Braskamp, & Newman, 1978) -- as critical to utilization, users in the Division H competition noted another critical reporting element: thoroughness. This element is implicit in several of the utilization framework factors, being most closely related to substance of evaluation information, which includes information specificity. Nonetheless, users' views on the importance of the evaluator's thoroughness in reporting merit further examination. The following comments are illustrative of these views:

> The depth and thoroughness of the first-year evaluation enabled me to spot quickly and accurately the problems with the project so that they could be remedied the next year.
>
> The thoroughness and detail on what went well, what did not, and why, gave me a wealth of information and insight which I could utilize, in detail.

This preference for detailed information, rather than just summaries and generalities, underscores an important point. Evaluators must demonstrate their thoroughness, but at the same time, they must know the individual users well enough to tailor their presentation of information to the cognitive styles and preferences of the users. The users quoted above obviously prefer that full and precise data be included within the report. Other users, with less of a need for fine detail, prefer a summary of evaluation highlights. Evaluators must satisfy both groups by providing comprehensive but readable reports along with

concise executive summaries. They should at all times preserve the impression that comprehensive data are available as back-up.

Style and format are two dimensions of evaluation reporting specifically included within the utilization framework. Report style is the manner in which the evaluation "message" (i.e., the findings) is executed. Marketers have identified several successful message execution styles: slice-of-life, mood or image, technical expertise, scientific evidence, and testimonial evidence (Kotler, 1980). The users in this sample tended to prefer styles that were literate, conversational, warm, and down-to-earth rather than overly formal and jargonistic. One user commented:

> E had the ability to translate facts and figures and charts that would normally baffle the layperson's mind into interesting material.

Another noted:

> All of the numbers, statistics, data were surrounded by literate prose with appropriate quotations from Alexis de Tocqueville.

Format, another component of message execution, can also make a difference in message impact. Format elements include the size and dimensions of the report, and its use of color, illustration, and other graphic elements. The importance of format was acknowledged by many users. The following comment is typical:

> E's reports have been exceptionally well accepted. Her formatting and special touches, such as attractive customized covers and pertinent cartoons, make the reading enjoyable and interesting.

Evaluator Involvement in Implementing Recommendations

Users' comments also focused on the evaluator's active role in the actual, hands-on implementation of the study recommendations. These evaluators went well beyond the conventional role of encouraging utilization -- they made certain of it. The following statements illustrate this proactive role:

> E took leadership and responsibility during discussions and in preparing proposals and plans for the Board of Education.
>
> E has been remarkably successful in working with academic units throughout the campus in institutionalizing outcome information on an ongoing basis.
>
> E has held workshops for teachers and staff and is always available to help solve problems.

Clearly, evaluator involvement in implementing recommendations may take many forms. In some instances, the evaluator conducts workshops on the findings as a step in potential implementation. Or the evaluator may interpret the action implications of particular recommendations. A similar phenomenon occurred in a study of Title I evaluators (Alkin, Stecher, & Geiger, 1982): One evaluator helped to attain utilization by "suggesting changes in the program, planning next year's workshop, developing a dissemination plan, and creating a meaningful attendance policy" (p. 2). In essence, this evaluator trained school district personnel to use data in making school decisions by giving them practice with the process.

Sociological theory on the management of change provides insight into how post-report evaluator behavior influences use.

Keen and Scott Morton (1978) hold that the change process consists of three stages: unfreezing, which serves to disturb the current stable equilibrium and introduces the need for change; moving, which involves striking out in a new direction; and refreezing, which requires integrating the change into existing behavioral frameworks to recreate a whole, natural entity. Management theorists (Katz & Kahn, 1978) claim that, while many change agents are successful in the first and second stages, they fail to realize the critical importance of the last stage. The evaluation process can be viewed as the first stage, the evaluation recommendations as the second stage, and the implementation of recommendations as the third stage. It is no wonder that evaluator involvement in this final stage of the change process characterizes high-use evaluations.

User Commitment to Use

User commitment to use, which was identified as an important user characteristic in all of our prior work, also turns out to be important in this study. Although users themselves did not often cite this factor -- perhaps because they were asked to focus on the evaluator in their documentation -- evaluators referred to it frequently, as the following comments show:

> The people involved were ready for the evaluation and the changes.

> The leadership of the Chancellor and the Provost . . . was one of the unique factors that contributed to my success in promoting the use of evaluation data.

To some extent, commitment to use is a personality characteristic of users and thus is already established by the time the evaluator enters the scene. The marketing literature (Rogers, 1962) places consumers on a continuum, depending upon their willingness to adopt new products or new ideas: early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. The users in this sample were clearly early adopters. Given their predisposition to try new ideas, they may have utilized any evaluation findings they were given. On the other hand, our earlier research (Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979) shows that the actions of the evaluator can positively influence the users' predisposition to use.

PROFILE OF A HIGH-UTILIZATION EVALUATOR

This study provides some insight into the characteristics and behavior of those evaluators whose work has a high probability of being utilized. High-utilization evaluators have personality traits -- concern, warmth, patience, integrity, openness, tact, willingness to listen -- that make them attractive to users from the outset. But they are also true leaders. Motivated by the desire to see their work utilized, they systematically enlist the participation of all potential users. They often violate the conventional image of the evaluation consultant by becoming involved in program operations and program improvement. In all of their leadership activities, however, these evaluators remain conscious of users' concerns and problems. They frequently assume the role of teacher, coaching

program personnel in evaluation techniques. Their enthusiasm is not lost on users, who perceive such evaluators as investing a great deal of effort in the evaluation process and as being truly concerned about improving the program being evaluated.

When preparing the evaluation report, high-utilization evaluators are careful to respond to the cognitive styles of the various users and to translate quantitative data into interesting information about the program. Once the evaluation report has been delivered, they continue their active involvement in the program by providing specific guidance in the implementation of the recommendations.

REFERENCES

Adams J.S. (1965). Injustice in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press.

Alkin M.C. (1982). Parameters of evaluation utilization/use. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 8, 153-155.

Alkin M.C. (1975). Evaluation: Who needs it? Who cares? Studies in Educational Evaluation, 1, 201-212.

Alkin M.C., Daillak R.H., & White P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Alkin M.C., Jacobson P., Burry J., Ruskus J., White P., & Kent L. (1985, in press). Handbook for evaluation decision-makers. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Alkin M.C., Stecher B.M., & Geiger F.L. (1982). Title I evaluation: Utility and factors influencing use. Northridge, CA: Educational Evaluation Associates.

Brown R.D., Braskamp L.A., & Newman D.L. (1978). Evaluator credibility as a function of report style: Do jargon and data make a difference? Evaluation Quarterly, 2 (2), 331-341.

Daillak R.H. (1980). A field study of evaluators at work (CSE Report No. 154). Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Festinger L. (1957). The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler F. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hollander E.P. (1978). Leadership Dynamics. New York: The Free Press.

House R.J., & Baetz M.L. (1979). Leadership: Some generalizations and new research directions. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), Research in organization behavior. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Katz D., & Kahn R. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Keen P.G.W., & Scott Morton M.S. (1978). Decision support systems. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kotler P. (1980). Marketing management (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Likert R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Likert R. (1961). New patterns in management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Patton M.Q., Grimes P.S., Guthrie K.M., Brennan N.J., French D.B., & Blyth D.A. (1978). In search of impact: An analysis of utilization of federal health evaluation research. In T.D. Cook and associates (Eds.), Evaluation Studies Review Annual (Vol. 3). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Rogers E.M. (1962). Diffusion of innovations. New York: The Free Press.

Stecher B.M., Alkin M.C., & Flesher F. (1981). Patterns of information use in school level decision making (CSE Report No. 160). Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Stogdill R. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Vroom V.H., & Yetton P. (1973). Leadership and decision making. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Weick K.E. (1966). The concept of equity in the perception of pay. Administrative Science Quarterly, 11, 414-439.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Application Form

AERA DIVISION H
AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN EVALUATION UTILIZATION

Evaluator: _____

Program evaluated: _____

School district/Organization: _____

Address: _____

_____

1. Briefly describe the program you evaluated.

2. What use was made of the evaluation information which you produced? Please describe in detail and provide documentation of use, if available. Do not send the evaluation report itself.

3. What were the unique factors in this evaluation contributing to making use happen?

Appendix B

Verification Form

AERA DIVISION H
AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN EVALUATION UTILIZATION

Dear _____:

Your evaluator, _____, who worked on the evaluation

of _____, is a nominee for an AERA
(name of program or project)
award for excellence in the area of promoting evaluation use. We would appreciate your comments to assist our panel in judging the performance of this nominee on the above-noted program evaluation.

1. In what way or ways was the evaluation information provided to you about the above program useful?

2. In your judgment, what aspects of the evaluator's own performance during the evaluation helped make the evaluation useful to you?

Mail this form directly to:

Dr. Marvin C. Alkin
Graduate School of Education
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Name: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Please return by March 1, 1984.

Appendix C

AERA DIVISION H
AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN EVALUATION UTILIZATION

REVIEWER RATING FORM

Please rate the applicant's submission, including documentation and validation, on the following criteria. Use the corroborating evidence submitted in support of the application to assist your judgments.

1. Conception of evaluation use:
   - _____ 1 the applicant showed little or no understanding of evaluation use
   - _____ 2
   - _____ 3 the applicant showed an acceptable level of understanding of evaluation use
   - _____ 4
   - _____ 5 the applicant showed full understanding of evaluation use

2. Degree of evaluation use:
   - _____ 1 no indication of evaluation use
   - _____ 2
   - _____ 3 some indication of evaluation use
   - _____ 4
   - _____ 5 strong indication of evaluation use

3. Degree of direct link between evaluator efforts and subsequent use:
   - _____ 1 no link was demonstrated between the evaluator's efforts and subsequent use
   - _____ 2
   - _____ 3 a minimal link was demonstrated between the evaluator's efforts and subsequent use
   - _____ 4
   - _____ 5 a strong link was demonstrated between the evaluator's efforts and subsequent use

4. Uniqueness/creativity of evaluator's effort at promoting use:
   - _____ 1 the evaluator showed no creativity or originality of effort
   - _____ 2
   - _____ 3 the evaluator showed a minimum of creativity or originality of effort
   - _____ 4
   - _____ 5 the evaluator showed a significant amount of creativity or originality of effort

5. Please rank the entries you have read.

Rank	Entry No.
___	_____
___	_____
___	_____
___	_____

Name of Reviewer _____

Date completed _____

Appendix D

Frequency of User Comments by Utilization Framework Categories[1]

Category	Factor	Element	Frequency	
Human Factors	Evaluator Characteristics			
		Commitment to use	3	
		Willingness to involve users[2]	6	
		Choice of role -- leadership[2]	13	
		Rapport with users	7	
		Political sensitivity	5	
		Credibility	9	
		Background and identity	6	
		Level of perceived effort[2]	6	
	Total Category Frequency			55
Context Factors	Project Characteristics			
		Innovativeness	1	
	Total Category Frequency			1
Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Procedures			
		Methods	18	
		Use of a general model	1	
	Information Dialogue			
		Amount and quality of interaction	6	
	Substance of Evaluation Information			
		Information relevance	9	
		Information specificity	7	

[1]These data are based on the comments of 34 users.

[2]This variation of the existing factor was newly discovered in this research.

Appendix D (cont'd.)

Category	Factor	Element	Frequency
Evaluation Factors (cont'd.)	Evaluation Reporting		
		Frequency of information provided	1
		Timing of information	3
		Style of oral presentations	1
		Format of reports	3
		Mix of statistical/narrative data	6
	Total Category Frequency		55
	Total Frequency		111

Appendix E

Frequency of Evaluator Comments by Utilization Framework Categories[3]

Category	Factor	Element	Frequency
Human Factors	Evaluator Characteristics		
		Willingness to involve users	7
		Choice of role	3
		Rapport with users	3
		Political sensitivity	2
		Credibility	2
	User Characteristics		
		Interest in the evaluation	2
		Commitment to use	4
		Professional style	1
	Total Category Frequency		24
Context Factors	Organizational Features		
		External features	2
	Total Category Frequency		2
Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Procedures		
		Methods	11
		Use of a general model	1
	Information Dialogue		
		Amount of interaction	1
	Substance of Evaluation Information		
		Information relevance	4
		Information specificity	1

[3]These data are based on the comments of 12 evaluators.

Appendix E (cont'd.)

Category	Factor	Element	Frequency
Evaluation Factors (cont'd.)	Evaluation Reporting		
		Frequency of information provided	2
		Timing of information	1
		Style of oral presentation	1
		Format of reports	2
		Mix of statistical/narrative data	3
	Total Category Frequency		27
	Total Frequency		53